

Un35ch:
3.C44
v5/4
Copy 1



CHILDREN'S LAW REPORT

A PROGRAM OF THE USC SCHOOL OF LAW

OCTOBER 2000
VOL. 5 No. 4

Focus Issue: Family Courts

One hundred years have passed since the state of Illinois enacted the *Juvenile Court Act*, a move widely recognized as marking the beginning of juvenile court reforms in the United States. Within 15 years of the enactment of the Illinois law, nearly every other state also passed laws creating juvenile courts. (The early history of the juvenile court is described in an article which begins on page 2.)

A logical extension of the juvenile court concept was the creation of unified family courts. These courts were designed to consider a broad range of issues affecting children and families, not solely abuse or delinquency. The trend toward family courts was in part a response to the 20th century development of family law. In early common law, the male head of household was paramount, and the rights of other family members were subordinate. With the establishment of women's legal rights, and the passage of child labor and other laws recognizing children, courts were called upon to respond to all family members. The development of family courts was also consistent with an effort within the legal system to unify court systems, increasing efficiency and preventing the overlap of jurisdictions.

New Jersey was one of the first states to start this trend when, in 1912, its legislature vested juvenile courts with jurisdiction for domestic relations disputes. In 1914, Ohio created a Division of Domestic Relations within its Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas, which was empowered to hear cases of divorce, alimony, delinquency, dependency, neglected and crippled children, adults contributing to or tending to cause delinquency or dependency, and failure to support. Located in Cincinnati, this court is regarded as the first "family court".

In this issue...

<i>Juvenile Court Centennial</i>	2
<i>Family Courts in South Carolina</i>	4
<i>Interview of Judge Mobley</i>	5
<i>The Court's Involvement in Child Protection</i>	7
<i>Model Courts</i>	8
<i>Future Directions of the Court</i>	9
<i>Richland County Drug Court</i>	10
<i>Handling Court Appointments CLE</i>	12

The concept of family court was slow to be implemented. During the first half of the 1900s, various experiments were tried. Some were successful while others were not. In 1959, the move toward family courts was renewed with the development of model legislation, the Standard Family Court Act, which was offered by the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges (now the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges), the National Probation and Parole Association, and the U.S. Children's Bureau.

State systems of family courts began to be established in the 1960s. South Carolina was among those in the forefront, with passage of the *Family Court Act of 1968*. (See article on South Carolina's Family Courts beginning on page 4.) Although many states still do not have family courts, the concept has gained wider acceptance with the growing recognition that all problems within a family are interrelated.

No single model has been adopted by all family courts, but rather they vary in terms of administrative structure, procedures, types of cases, affiliated services, and staffing. Types of matters heard may be marital actions, juvenile proceedings, adoptions, paternity actions, custody and visitation, orders of protection, civil commitments, and criminal domestic violence cases. The concept of "family court" then is characterized not by a particular structure, but by the underlying principles that courts should be sensitive to the unique needs of children and that all issues involving children and families should be addressed in a single legal forum. The need to be flexible in addressing serious family problems, combined with the need to uphold legal principles, presents unique challenges to family courts. This issue of the *Children's Law Report* examines their evolving role.

Sources:

LeRoy Ashby, *Endangered Children: Dependency, Neglect, and Abuse in American History* (1997)

Barbara A. Babb, *Where We Should Stand: An Analysis of America's Family Law Adjudicatory Systems and the Mandate to Establish Unified Family Courts*, 32 *Family Law Quarterly* 31 (1998)

Sanford J. Fox, *The Early History of the Court*, in *The Future of Children* 6 (1996)

Hunter Hurst, Jr., *Family Courts in the United States*, in 1 *Family Court Bulletin* (Fall 1999)

Hon. Robert W. Page, "Family Courts": *An Effective Judicial Approach to the Resolution of Family Disputes*, 44 *Juvenile & Family Court Journal* (1993)

Juvenile Court Centennial

The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges celebrated the centennial of the juvenile court last year in Chicago. The Illinois *Juvenile Court Act of 1899* was the first legislation establishing a separate court to handle cases involving children, and Chicago is considered to be the birthplace of the juvenile court. This American institution has been replicated in other countries.

The impetus behind the creation of juvenile courts was a desire to fashion a less punitive and more effective response to delinquent juveniles. This new approach resulted in a less formal court environment in which the role of adversarial trials diminished in favor of informal hearings which focused

on rehabilitating the juvenile. Early juvenile courts also considered abuse and neglect cases, with both dependent and delinquent children often being housed in the same institutions, called industrial schools.

The *Juvenile Court Act* prohibited placing children in jails, but still allowed placement in the almshouses or poorhouses of that time. The Act established rules to be followed in cases involving children, requiring that courts provide rehabilitation rather than punishment and that court procedures be informal.

The need for a specialized court was based on three premises: (1) Children are dependent on adults in a unique way. If parents do not properly care for their children, then the state must intervene and provide for the care and supervision of the child. (2) Children, who are still developing both intellectually and emotionally, are more amenable to treatment. Therefore, rehabilitation, rather than punishment, is the most appropriate focus. (3) Children are not able to comprehend the court system in the manner of an adult, and require a special forum.

The philosophy of rehabilitation continued with judges often functioning like social workers in deciding what should happen to the children who appeared before them. The informality was such that judges would speak directly with the juveniles, asking them what they had done and then fashioning the appropriate remedy. Often the issue of guilt or innocence was not considered, and abused and neglected children were treated the same as those charged with crimes. The court was presumed to be benevolent, so rights for children were seen as unnecessary.

The juvenile court's informality and paternalism continued until the 1960s when the United States Supreme Court issued two momentous decisions. In *Kent v. United States*, 383 U.S. 541 (1966), the Court held that due process rights of children required a hearing before transferral from juvenile court to adult court. *In Re: Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967), is the pivotal case which shifted the emphasis away from informality to strict rules of procedure. In this case, the Court held that a child tried in juvenile court is to be afforded the same due process rights as an adult. These include the right to notice of charges, appointment of an attorney if unable to afford one, the right to confront witnesses, and the right to be free from self-incrimination.

This trend toward formal procedures of law continues today, with the need for due process guarantees of utmost importance. As a response to rising juvenile crime rates in recent decades, significant changes have occurred in the juvenile justice system. Many states have passed laws making it easier to transfer juveniles to the adult criminal justice system, expanding sentencing authority, and limiting confidentiality. As the victims' rights movement has grown, greater attention is being paid to victims of juvenile crime. Although the goal of rehabilitation has not been eradicated, the juvenile court system is striving to balance this ideal with the need to demand accountability from juveniles, protect the public, deter future crime, and respond to the rights of victims.

Sources:

Coalition for Juvenile Justice, *A Celebration Or a Wake?* (1998)

Sanford J. Fox, *The Early History of the Court*, in *The Future of Children* 6 (1996)

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, *Juvenile Justice: A Century of Change* (1999)

Carol S. Stevenson, et.al., *The Juvenile Court: Analysis and Recommendations*, in *The Future of Children* 6 (1996)

Family Courts in South Carolina

South Carolina has been quite progressive in its development of a family court system. Juvenile courts began with the 1912 passage of *An Act to Enlarge and Define the Duties and Power of Probate Court in Relation to Minors*. This Act empowered the state to investigate and assume custody of children under the age of 18 in cases of homelessness, destitution, and neglect. Procedures were established in which judges could talk with youths in a quiet, informal manner focusing on their best interests. A variety of local experiments were tried in the early 1900s. For example, jurisdiction over children was vested in municipal courts, separate divisions within probate courts, and county courts. The first separate county-wide juvenile court was established in 1927 in Greenville, and a Domestic Relations Court in Charleston County in 1936 was the first to be granted exclusive original jurisdiction over children alleged to be delinquent. Thirteen counties were empowered by special legislation in 1962 to establish independent juvenile and domestic relations courts.

Standardization came in 1968, with passage of the *Family Court Act* which established a plan for locally maintained family courts. Any county which established a juvenile or domestic relations court was required to follow the procedures set forth in the *Family Court Act*. The purpose of family courts was described as follows:

[F]amilies whose unity or well-being is threatened shall be assisted and protected, and restored if possible as secure units of law-abiding members; and that each child coming within the jurisdiction of the court shall receive, preferably in his own home, the care, guidance and control that will conduce to his welfare and the best interests of the State, and that when he is removed from the control of his parents the court shall secure for him care as nearly as possible equivalent to that which they should have given him.

The family courts had jurisdiction for children who were neglected, abandoned, or whose behavior or associations endangered themselves or others; for children who violated the law or were "beyond the control" of their custodian; commitments to mental institutions of children; termination of parental rights; adoption; and domestic relations actions such as divorce, support, and annulments.

Judges, who were paid by the county, were required to be a resident of the county, to have five years' experience as an attorney, and to be "regarded as having personality and interests compatible with the functions of the office." They set their own schedule, and were allowed to serve in other judicial or quasi-judicial capacities.

In these early family courts, judges could conduct a preliminary inquiry after being informed by any person that a child fell within the purview of the Act. The court could then make "such informal adjustments as is practicable" or authorize the filing of a petition. Hearings were conducted in an informal manner and could be adjourned from time to time. Notes or other transcripts were only kept if required by the judge. The courts had a variety of options, including commitment of a child to an institution or granting guardianship to an appropriate person. The court could also dismiss a petition,

order further examinations, order other care and treatment as the court thought best, or place a child on probation. Probation was defined not as punishment, but as a system of casework services intended for the protection, guidance, and well-being of the child and family. Probation officers were paid by the county and worked directly for the judge.

In cases which could involve commitment to an institution, children were protected against self-incrimination and had the right of cross-examination. Children were to have all of the rights afforded an adult where required by law. Where not specifically required, however, the *Family Court Act* provided that children were to be "accorded such adult rights as shall be consistent with the best interests of the child."

A statewide family court system was implemented on July 1, 1977, as part of the legislature's plan to phase in a unified court system. All county family courts, juvenile courts, and domestic relations courts were abolished on this date, and their jurisdiction devolved upon the statewide family court system. Under this new system, a family court was created for each judicial circuit. Family courts under the statewide system had the same authority and jurisdiction as did the previous county courts, except that juveniles charged with rape or murder could be transferred to circuit court to be treated as criminals rather than as children. Family courts had also been authorized in 1974 to order protective services or placement for vulnerable adults, with passage of the state's first adult protection law.

Under the statewide system, family courts became courts of record and were administered by the Supreme Court. Counties were responsible for providing the courtroom facilities, but judges, secretaries, and court reporters were paid by the state. Judges were full-time, and were prohibited from practicing law. They were elected by the legislature, after review by the Judicial Qualification Screening Committee. Under this Act, solicitors became responsible for all prosecutorial functions in family court. (Solicitors are still responsible for the prosecution of juveniles, but child protection matters are now presented by attorneys hired by the Department of Social Services.)

While many states still do not have specialized family courts, South Carolina can be proud of its long attention to the needs of children and families in the legal system.

Sources:

Act No. 1195, *South Carolina Acts & Joint Resolutions 1968*

Act No. 690, *South Carolina Acts & Joint Resolutions 1976*

John Trotti, *Juvenile Justice Timeline*, unpublished research (1999); copy available from the Children's Law Office

Interview of Judge Mobley

Judge Barry Mobley has been a family court judge for the Sixth Judicial Circuit, which covers the counties of Chester, Fairfield, and Lancaster, since 1982. Judge Mobley was interviewed about his experience in family court.

Q: What was your background before being elected as a family court judge?

A: I practiced law for 18 years as a sole practitioner with a general practice that included family and criminal law. Then there was no public defender's office so I was appointed in juvenile cases or retained.

Q: What have been some remarkable changes that you have seen in the area of juvenile law?

A: The area of juvenile rights has been advanced. Juveniles always had rights but they were not afforded their rights. Previously, there was the agency of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare, which prosecuted cases and then offered counseling as well. There was no legal representation for the juveniles. They came into court with their parents and that was it.

Q: What changes in the juvenile court have you seen across the state as you hold court in different counties?

A: I have seen a more even application across the state of juvenile laws due to the training that the judges receive at the judicial CLEs. I have noticed this as well with solicitors due to their conferences having a juvenile law track now. I occasionally allow a juvenile to represent himself, but attorneys represent 99 percent. Usually the attorneys are from the public defender's office or, if there is a conflict, an appointed attorney.

Q: What needs to be done to keep juvenile court viable?

A: Continuing legal education for judges, lawyers, and persons who work for the Department of Juvenile Justice around juvenile issues.

Q: What are the most difficult decisions you have to make as a juvenile court judge?

A: Determining the guilt or innocence of a juvenile when I have a "he said she said" situation. I don't have 12 people trying to determine innocence or guilt, it is just one person. Another difficult decision is when a juvenile has two or three offenses and the recommendation is to send him to DJJ. Sometimes sending him to DJJ might make him more of a criminal because of the juveniles that are there.

Q: What are the highlights of your time as a juvenile court judge?

A: In one particular case, the juvenile had a record, was expelled from school, stole a car, and did drugs. The recommendation was to send him off, but I placed him with relatives and set strict rules for him to follow. One year later I heard the child received the Most Improved Student award at school. I had a gut reaction about this child and am glad I followed it.

Q: What characteristics do you think a juvenile court judge should have?

A: A juvenile court judge needs a broad background in the practice of law. He or she needs to have practiced in a variety of areas in a small practice where he or she did it all, from checking titles to criminal law to civil litigation.

Q: What advice would you give to a new juvenile court judge?

A: I would tell a new juvenile court judge to go sit in on general sessions cases, because what happens there happens with juvenile cases except for sentencing. He or she should read all the statutes and cases and observe in other family courts. He or she should go see DJJ and get to know what they do.

Q: What trends do you see in the next millennium in juvenile court?

A: We are seeing more females committing crimes. Juveniles are committing worse crimes, like the school shootings. There are more sex offenses with younger and younger perpetrators.

The Court's Involvement in Child Protection

Although delinquency was the primary focus, child abuse and neglect also began to be addressed in early juvenile courts. The trend toward formality in court proceedings in delinquency matters was also seen in child protection cases, with parents being afforded specific legal rights. The court's role in child protection matters was standardized with passage of the first significant federal legislation on child abuse and neglect, the *Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974*, which required appointment of guardians *ad litem* for children.

The court's primary role in the 1970s was to determine whether or not abuse had occurred. If the court found that abuse had occurred, it also decided whether the children should stay at home with their parents or be placed in foster care. The early role of the court in child protection matters thus ended with the removal or merits hearing.

The court's involvement was necessary to provide a legal framework for child protection intervention. Families have a right to live without interference from state agencies unless there is a compelling reason to intervene, such as the abuse or neglect of a child. The court provides a method of oversight, giving parents the opportunity to question or contest the intervention.

The *Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980* expanded the role of the court. Earlier legislation, which was enacted soon after identification of the "battered child syndrome", had stressed protection of children from violent homes. The *Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act* addressed the welfare of children after they were removed, responding to concerns that children remained in foster care too long without sufficient attention to their need for permanency. In order to receive federal funding for foster care, states had to comply with standards. These included taking steps to prevent removal of children and to reunify families after children were placed in foster care. When reunification was not possible, alternative safe and permanent homes were to be found. The court's expanded role included ongoing supervision after removal. Courts had to make specific findings that the agency had taken reasonable efforts to prevent removal and for family reunification. Courts were called upon to oversee case plans, including a variety of issues such as treatment, support, and visitation, and to assure that children were placed in permanent homes as early as possible.

In addition to the new functions, which required review or permanency planning hearings, the emphasis on permanency led to an increase in the numbers of termination of parental rights and

adoption cases heard by the courts. The number of child abuse and neglect cases also increased dramatically.

The most recent federal legislation affecting child protection court proceedings was the *Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (ASFA)*. Among the key provisions of this act was a clarification of reasonable efforts requirements. While reasonable efforts to prevent removal and to reunify continued to be required in most cases, *ASFA* defined certain cases that are excepted from this requirement and stated that the child's health and safety must be a paramount concern in all cases. *ASFA* provided that foster parents and pre-adoptive parents caring for a child were to receive notice of hearings and be provided an opportunity to be heard. Permanency hearings, to determine the child's permanent plan, were required to be held within twelve months. States were also required to initiate or join termination of parental rights actions when a child has been in foster care for fifteen of the most recent twenty-two months, an infant has been found by the court to be abandoned, or a parent has assaulted a child leading to serious bodily injury or assaulted or killed another child. States can establish certain exceptions to this provision, as South Carolina has in S.C. Code Ann. §20-7-768(C)(Supp. 1999). *ASFA* also required states to actively seek adoptive placements and to document their efforts, including child specific recruitment efforts.

Recognition of all the challenges facing family courts handling child protection cases has led to initiatives such as the Child Victims Model Court Project and the State Court Improvement Program, which are designed to assist courts in meeting these requirements more effectively and efficiently.

Model Courts

The Child Victims Model Court Project was established by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) in 1992 with both private and federal funding. With Congressional passage of the *Victims of Child Abuse Act*, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention provided substantial funding so that NCJFCJ could work with model courts nationwide to improve responses to victims of child abuse and neglect.

The Child Victims Model Court Project first developed a document that could be used by family court judges to improve the court's handling of child maltreatment cases. *Resource Guidelines: Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse & Neglect Cases* was designed as a hands-on bench book. The *Resource Guidelines* publication has been endorsed by the Conference of Chief Justices and the American Bar Association.

The second step of the Child Victims Model Court Project was to identify a limited number of courts which would focus on improved practice in child abuse and neglect cases. The Hamilton County Juvenile Court in Cincinnati was the project's first model court. Twenty-two model courts are now operating across the country, including the Mecklenburg County Juvenile Court in Charlotte under the leadership of Judge William G. Jones. The lead judges in each jurisdiction guide model court teams as they identify barriers to permanency, develop plans for improving the court's functioning, and work towards systems change. Model courts have implemented a variety of innovations that can be

replicated by other courts, such as data management and case tracking systems, diversion programs, alternative dispute resolution, mediation, and family group conferencing.

For more information about model courts, contact the Permanency Planning for Children Department of the NCJFCJ at (775) 327-5300. The model courts can also be contacted directly, and a list is available from the Children's Law Office or on the NCJFCJ's website at <www.ncjfcj.unr.edu>.

A similar initiative is the State Courts Improvement Program which is funded through the *Family Preservation Act*. Through that program, state supreme courts assess child abuse and neglect case processing and implement plans for court improvement. The South Carolina Supreme Court has recently secured this funding to advance the court's use of technology.

Recommended Reading:

(available for loan from the Children's Law Office):

Mark Hardin, *Judicial Implementation of Permanency Planning Reform: One Court That Works* (1992)

Mark Hardin, H. Ted Rubin, and Debra Ratterman Baker, *A Second Court That Works: Judicial Implementation of Permanency Planning Reforms* (1995)

National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, *Resource Guidelines: Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse and Neglect Cases* (1995)

Future Directions of the Court

Recent trends in family courts across the nation include an expanded role in child maltreatment cases in accordance with federal law and the increasing focus on children's need for permanency. The court's function in delinquency cases has been reduced somewhat, with more violent offenders being transferred to the adult criminal system and status offenders being addressed through community-based services. Judge Leonard Edwards, supervising judge of the Family Relations Division of the Santa Clara County Superior Court in California, has commented on future directions of the court. He points out three areas in which the court can be expected to evolve.

First, court structures will continue to be refined and streamlined. Judge Edwards believes there will be increasing utilization of unified family courts, and development of better mechanisms for coordination among courts. Better handling and supervision of multiple cases within the same family will result from these efforts.

Second, the use of alternative dispute resolution techniques will be expanded, with the formal court system being used as a last resort or for the most serious and contested cases. Courts will approve and monitor agreements, issuing orders as necessary.

Alternative dispute resolution techniques provide for more efficient use of court resources, and may be more effective than an adversarial process. They are based on the premise that individuals who are involved in developing an agreement will be more likely to abide by the terms of that agreement. One example of alternative dispute resolution is mediation, in which trained professionals meet with family members in a confidential setting to attempt to resolve legal problems without a formal court proceeding. Other examples are peer or teen courts, family group conferences, settlement conferences, diversion programs, and school-based truancy courts. Judge Edwards believes that the array of alternative techniques will continue to expand in the future.

Finally, private and voluntary efforts will be used to assist the court in accomplishing its goals. Judge Edwards expects to see more partnerships with the private sector, and mobilization of community wide efforts on behalf of children. For example, the volunteer Court Appointed Special Advocate program was started by a juvenile court judge who was concerned that abused and neglected children were not getting the attention they needed. Youth mentoring programs have been developed as court-related programs in which trained volunteers are matched with delinquent children.

Although the family court will undergo changes, it will continue to be a viable institution. Through this court, society holds children accountable for their conduct and parents accountable for raising children. According to Judge Edwards, the question is not whether these courts will continue to exist, but what form they will have, what their status within the hierarchy of the court system will be, what types of cases will be heard, what resources will be available, and how well the needs of children, their families, and the community will be served.

Source:

Hon. Leonard P. Edwards, *The Future of the Juvenile Court: Promising New Directions*, in *The Future of Children* 6 (1996)

Richland County Drug Court

The Juvenile Drug Court is an innovative program which is designed to respond more effectively to non-violent juvenile offenders who have substance abuse problems. The essence of a drug court is the provision of immediate intervention and structure through the on-going, active involvement and oversight of the drug court judge. This article highlights a juvenile drug court operating in Richland County under the supervision of Judge Bruce Williams. (Charleston County also has a juvenile drug court which was spearheaded by Judge Segars-Andrews, and Lexington County has recently begun a program under the direction of Judge Chewning.)

The juvenile drug court combines continuous judicial supervision, the immediate use of incentives or sanctions, and coordination with schools, treatment providers, and other community agencies. Juveniles are required to participate in treatment, submit to frequent drug testing, appear at regular court status hearings, and follow other conditions ordered by the court. Drug court meets in the evening, and differs further from the typical family court process in several ways.

First, not every juvenile qualifies for the drug court program. In Richland County juveniles are eligible who are between the ages of twelve and sixteen and a half, have committed non-violent crimes, and have a history of using alcohol or other drugs. They cannot have a history of violent behavior or incarceration in a long-term juvenile justice facility.

Second, juveniles in this program receive regular, focused attention for a longer period of time than in usual court proceedings. After having been found to be delinquent, the juvenile is placed on probation and begins the drug court program. The three-phase program lasts for nine to twelve months, with the juvenile appearing before Judge Williams on a weekly basis in the beginning. With progress, court appearances may gradually be reduced to once a month. In addition to the status hearings, drug court staff gauge the juvenile's progress through regular home and school visits.

Third, juveniles in this program receive regular feedback on their progress. The juvenile receives rewards for successes and is sanctioned when he or she fails to make progress. For example, incentives include gift certificates for fun parks or restaurants. Participants are also motivated by the praise and encouragement offered by the judge and other staff. Sanctions for noncompliance may range from a writing assignment to incarceration.

Fourth, juveniles and their families receive a wide array of services, such as health care, tutoring, mentoring, and therapy. These services focus on five areas: (1) substance abuse problems, (2) delinquency, (3) school attendance and performance, (4) vocational training, and (5) family issues.

For juveniles who successfully complete drug court, the related charges are dismissed. Failure to complete the program is treated as a probation violation, and sentencing is determined in a traditional dispositional hearing.

This drug court is possible because many of the involved professionals volunteer their time after regular working hours. Initiated by the Fifth Circuit Youth Council, the Juvenile Drug Court in Richland County is a cooperative project of many entities, including the Fifth Judicial Circuit Solicitor's Office, the South Carolina Department of Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Services, the Lexington/Richland Alcohol and Drug Abuse Council, the Fifth Judicial Circuit Family Court, the Richland County Public Defender's Office, and the Richland County Department of Juvenile Justice.

Sources:

Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, *Juvenile and Family Drug Courts: An Overview*, <http://www.american.edu/justice/juvoverview.htm>

Kelly Robinson, Program Coordinator, Juvenile Drug Court, Richland County

Mitch Mackinem, Program Director, Drug Court, Fifth Judicial Circuit

Handling Court Appointments CLE

Still time to register!

Handling Court Appointments
November 17, 2000
8:30 am - 5:00 pm
Midlands Technical College, Airport Campus
West Columbia

Effective representation is critical to the children and families involved in child protection matters. This upcoming CLE is designed for lawyers, particularly young lawyers, all of whom are subject to appointments in family court child protection cases. Roles and responsibilities will be clarified in this seminar, which will include an introduction to child maltreatment, a statutory overview, and a summary of court process. The ethical considerations of court appointments will be addressed by a panel of judges. Topics will be approached in a practical and succinct manner, providing information that will be immediately useful to practitioners. Comprehensive materials are included in the registration cost.

Pre-registration is suggested in order to guarantee receipt of materials. Fee is \$65 for experienced attorneys, and \$35 for those who have graduated from law school within the last three years. This seminar qualifies for up to 6.0 MCLE credits, including 1.0 hours of ethics. Call (803) 777-1646 to register.

Children's Law Office
University of South Carolina
Carolina Plaza, 12th Floor
Columbia, SC 29208

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. Postage Paid
Permit #766
Columbia, SC

S. C. STATE LIBRARY

JUL 9 2001

STATE DOCUMENTS